

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-16 are rejected. Claims 2 and 10 are objected to. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 17-20 were previously cancelled.

Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9-10, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Amemiya et al., (hereinafter “Amemiya”), (US 6,002,550). Claims 5-6, 8, 13-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amemiya (US 6,002,550) in view of Koishi (US 2003/0002218) (hereinafter “Koishi 1”). Claims 1-7 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koishi et al., (hereinafter “Koishi 2”) (US 6,157,518) in view of Koshikawa et al., (hereinafter “Koshikawa”) (US 6,181,531).

Applicants submit the cited Amemiya reference does not teach or suggest at least “[a] slider for high density magnetic recording, comprising... a body with a width of between 0.6mm and 1.0mm and a length greater than 0.85mm and a thickness of 0.23mm or less, wherein the length to the width ratio is greater than 1.5 ...” (e.g., as described in claim 1).

In forwarding its current rejection, the Office Action cites to column 8, lines 45-46, which state: “It is preferable that the head chip 1 be 1.0mm deep (long), 0.5mm wide 0.2mm or below in thickness”. See Office Action dated 10/29/2007, page 4. The cited section fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Applicants submit that similar to this section, the entire Amemiya reference fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. See the embodiment of Figure 10 and its related description at column 7, lines 22-27.

Koishi 1 fails to make up for the deficiencies of Amemiya. Although Koishi 1 is directed to negative pressure type head slider, it fails to teach or suggest a slider embodiment as described

in claim 1. Koishi 2 is directed to a head slider having a trapezoidal shape; it does not disclose a slider embodiment as described in claim 1 as well. Finally, Koshikawa is directed to a thin film magnetic head slider and electrostatic actuator for driving a head element; it is not directed to a slider embodiment as described in claim 1.

Since each and every limitation of claim 1 is not taught by the cited Amemiya reference, the current §102(b) rejection of claim 1 is lacking and should be withdrawn. Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable; claim 9 contains similar allowable limitations, and therefore is allowable as well. Claims 2-8 and 10-16 are allowable for depending from allowable base claims.

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: April 29, 2008

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501